

must take on a greater share in the costs of the project.

The bill requires independent review of Corps projects. The National Academy of Sciences, the General Accounting Office, and even the Inspector General of the Army agree that independent review is essential to assure that each Corps project is economically justified.

The bill also requires strong environmental protection measures. S. 2188 requires the Corps to mitigate the environmental impacts of its projects in a variety of ways, including by avoiding damaging wetlands in the first place and either holding other lands or constructing wetlands elsewhere when it cannot avoid destroying them. The Corps requires private developers to meet this standard when they construct projects as a condition of receiving a federal permit, and the federal government should live up to the same standard.

Too often, the Corps does not complete required mitigation and actually enhances environmental risks. I feel strongly that the Corps must complete its mitigation and the public should be able to track the progress of mitigation projects. In addition, the concurrent mitigation requirements of this bill would actually reduce the total mitigation costs by ensuring the purchase of mitigation lands as soon as possible.

This bill streamlines the existing automatic deauthorization process for the \$58 billion project backlog, and it will keep the Corps focused on its primary missions of flood control, navigation, and environmental protection. Under the bill a project authorized for construction but never started is deauthorized if it is denied appropriations funds towards construction for 5 straight years. In addition, a project that has begun construction but been denied appropriations funds toward construction for 3 straight years is deauthorized. The bill also preserves congressional prerogatives over setting the Corps' construction priorities by allowing Congress a chance to reauthorize any of these projects before they are automatically deauthorized. This process will be transparent to all interests, because the bill requires the Corps to make an annual list of projects in the construction backlog available to Congress and the public at large.

This measure will bring about a comprehensive revision of the project review and authorization procedures at the Army Corps of Engineers. My goals for the Corps are to increase transparency and accountability, to ensure fiscal responsibility, and to allow greater stakeholder involvement in their projects. I remain committed to these goals, and to seeing Corps reform enacted as part of this Congress' water resources bill.

I feel that this bill is an important step down the road to a reformed Corps of Engineers. This bill establishes a

framework to catch mistakes by Corps planners, deter any potential bad behavior by Corps officials to justify questionable projects, end old unjustified projects, and provide planners desperately needed support against the never-ending pressure of project boosters. Those boosters, include congressional interests, which is why I believe that this body needs to champion reform—to end the perception that Corps projects are all pork and no substance. All too often Members of Congress have seen Corps projects as a way to bring home the bacon, rather than ensuring that the taxpayers get the most bang for their Federal buck.

I wish it were the case that the changes we are proposing today were not needed, but unfortunately, I see that there is need for this bill. I want to make sure that future Corps projects no longer fail to produce predicted benefits, stop costing the taxpayers more than the Corps estimated, do not have unanticipated environmental impacts, and are built in an environmentally compatible way. This bill will help the Corps do a better job, which is what the taxpayers and the environment deserve.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EVERYONE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 4, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4) to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to the States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Boxer/Kennedy amendment No. 2945, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 60 minutes equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee.

The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Senators BOXER and KENNEDY to raise the minimum wage.

The last time we increased the minimum wage was in 1997, and workers have already lost all of those gains of that increase. To have the purchasing power the minimum wage had in 1968, the minimum wage would have to be more than \$8 an hour, not the \$5.15 today.

In 1968, we could afford it. In 1968, we could provide the wages that would en-

able Americans to save for homes, to purchase homes, to save for college education, and to educate young people. Today, working Americans do not have that opportunity because the minimum wage is not sufficient to support a family and support the aspirations that all Americans have to better themselves and their children.

Indeed, what is very startling is if we had increased the minimum wage at the same rate CEO compensation had increased, the minimum wage today would be \$22 an hour. In fact, it raises the fundamental question we will address over many months and years ahead, which is whether the rest of the world is going to become like the United States with a strong middle class with opportunities to move forward or will we become more like the rest of the world with a huge divergence between the very wealthy and those who are working for very little.

I believe we have to have a society that continues to produce a strong middle class, that continues to make work something that allows an individual to provide for their families and to aspire to all of the dreams of American home ownership, education for their children, and a comfortable and secure retirement.

Indeed, the fact that the minimum wage has relatively decreased has contributed to a doubling of poverty. A minimum wage earner for a family of three who works 40 hours a week 52 weeks a year earns \$10,700. That is \$4,500 below the poverty line. Today, if you are working 40 hours a week for minimum wage, you are in poverty.

The proposed increase would bring the minimum wage to \$7 an hour, and even this modest increase would only raise the annual salary of families to about \$14,000.

It is not sufficient to replace what people had in 1968. It is not sufficient to ensure all families are above poverty. But increasing the minimum wage will at least give more opportunity, more hope, and more sustenance to the families in America.

Today, one in five children lives below the poverty line in our Nation. This is the richest Nation in the world. That poverty has an effect on them; indeed, in the long run, it has an effect on everyone. There is an adage: You can pay now or you can pay later. We are not paying now and we will pay later. We pay later in terms of children who do not have the educational skills or the health to become the most constructive workers in our society they could become. In fact, some of them, unfortunately, wander into crime and other areas which cost us immensely. We have to be able to ensure people can afford to live in this country.

One of the other aspects of the minimum wage is a family earning a minimum wage in this country cannot effectively afford a two-bedroom apartment in any of the major metropolitan areas and in many rural areas. That is unfortunate. Without proper housing,